

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/016,839	DARCANGELO ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Carlos Lopez	1731	

**All Participants:**

(1) Carlos Lopez.

(2) Adenike Adewuya .
**Status of Application: Pending**

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 4 May 2004
**Time:** 4:55pm
**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

N/A

Claims discussed:

6

Prior art documents discussed:

Deeren et al and Neidorf

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:


See Continuation Sheet

**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



(Examiner/SPE Signature)



(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: It was noted to applicant that claim 6 read on Deeren et al reference. Applicant proposed amending claim 6 to recite that the claimed assembly was not in bundle form but in a layered horizontal form as shown in figure 6A. However, it was noted that applicant's proposal would invoke a 103(a) rejection under Deeren in view of Niedorf. Applicant then agreed to revert to the original language of claim 6 and change its dependency to the indicated allowed claim 13.